



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

this mode of tinting linen as opposed to the solid tempera, no doubt was, that in the humid climate of England and the Netherlands it was less liable to be affected by damp than coloring with more "body" or substance.

Mrs. Merrifield, in her *Ancient Practice of Painting*, thinks it not at all improbable that some of the early transparent paintings executed in Germany, France, and England may have been intended and used occasionally instead of glass for windows, when glass was extremely rare and costly. A practice prevailed also in England, previous to the introduction of printing with blocks, of painting linen cloth intended for wearing apparel, as well as probably altar-cloths and hangings of apartments, with figures, flowers, and various devices, in imitation of embroidery.

(To be continued.)

Architecture.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

Regular Meeting of February 1st, 1859.—The Committee on the Diploma reported progress.

The Committee on the Library presented the following report:

TO THE PUBLIC.

The American Institute of Architects is an association organized within the past two years. It has permanent rooms in the New York University, and has for its object the advancement of architecture in this country.

Although the association has thus far succeeded more rapidly than its founders ventured to hope, and embraces all, or nearly all, the professional architects of this city and the vicinity, yet an essential condition of complete success remains unfulfilled, viz.: the establishment of an architectural library. A few volumes have been collected, but little progress has been made towards anything worthy of the character or objects of the association.

It is well known that, notwithstanding the immense material progress and prosperity of this country, no commensurate advance has been made in its architecture. While our means actually entitle us to be, architecturally, in advance of most of the countries of Europe, we are lamentably behind both in taste and in the knowledge of the principles of this great department of Art.

It is not our object to point out the reasons for this backwardness, however obvious. But we appeal, with all our heart, and we may add with all confidence, to the generous public, to aid us in removing it.

The first step to be taken, it is plain, is the establishment of an architectural library, to which the public at large, as well as professional men may at all hours of the evening, as well as the day, have free access. The great foreign works on architecture are so expensive as to be beyond the range of most private libraries, and if they are included in the beneficent sweep of the Astor Library, yet the plan and character of that noble institution, which of necessity do not permit it to be open in the evenings, nor works of the present character to be examined except under special circumstances, make it unavailable for the purpose we have in view.

We therefore earnestly solicit subscriptions for the above-named object. The books, as rapidly as procured, will be placed in a room in the New York University, and when a sufficient number have been obtained, a suitable library will be opened to the profession and to the public.

We need hardly add that the Institute has every facility, both at home and abroad, for obtaining the best works within the scope of the plan proposed, and that the generous benefactors of the library may be

assured that their donations shall be faithfully and judiciously applied.

Contributions may be handed to any of the undersigned at their residences as given below.

Trustees.

RICHARD UPJOHN,.....	New York.
THOS. U. WALTER,.....	Washington, D. C.
R. M. HUNT,.....	New York.
JOHN W. RITCH,.....	"
JOSEPH C. WELLS,.....	New York City.

List of Members for Year 1859.

BABCOCK, CHARLES,.....	New York City.
BROWN, EDWIN L.,.....	Boston.
CABOT, ED. C.,.....	"
CLARE, EDWARD,.....	Washington, D. C.
CLARELAND, H. W.,.....	New York City.
DIAPER, FRED.,.....	"
DUDLEY, HENRY,.....	"
EIDLITZ, LEOPOLD,.....	"
GAMBRILL, CHAS. (a.),.....	"
GILMAN, ARTHUR,.....	Boston.
HART, J. COLEMAN,.....	New York City.
HATFIELD, R. G.,.....	"
HATFIELD, O. P.,.....	"
LIENAU, DETLIF,.....	"
MOULD, J. WREY,.....	"
MORSE, ALPHEUS,.....	Providence, R. I.
NIERNSEE, JOHN R.,.....	Columbia, S. C.
PETERSEN, F. A.,.....	New York City.
PRIEST, J. W.,.....	Newburgh, N. Y.
QUINCY, EDWARD, JR.,.....	New York City.
RENWICK, JAMES,.....	"
RINTOUL, JOHN A. (a.),.....	"
ROGERS, JOHN,.....	"
SANDS, JOSEPH,.....	"
SNELL, GEORGE,.....	Boston.
TEFFT, T. A.,.....	Providence, R. I.
UPJOHN, RICHARD M.,.....	New York City.
VAN BRUNT, HENRY (a.),.....	"
VAUX, CALVERT,.....	"
WARNER, S. A.,.....	"
WELCH, JOHN,.....	Newark, N. J.
WITHERS, FRED. C.,.....	Newburgh, N. Y.

Regular Meeting of February 15th, 1859.—The general business of the meeting being transacted, J. Coleman Hart read the following paper on

UNITY IN ARCHITECTURE.

Before proceeding to remark upon this subject, it is necessary that I should preface this paper with some consideration of the definitions of the term architecture. It is evident that a clear and full definition of this word is necessary to the correct understanding of this subject.

It is not uncommon to find persons who have no distinct idea of architecture; and this is not to be wondered at, when its professors are so much at variance as to its true meaning.

Ruskin, in his "Seven Lamps of Architecture," has shown the necessity of a clear understanding of the term, by inserting his definition of the word at the beginning of the book, that no misunderstanding might arise between him and his reader. I hope my authority will be a sufficient apology for intruding

upon the Institute an analysis of that which may seem so commonplace.

Webster says that "Architecture is the art of building." He gives the original Greek of the word to assist his definition. That this definition is vague and full of doubt, I think you will not deny. And when he attempts to make it plainer by saying that it is, in a "more limited and appropriate sense, the art of constructing houses, bridges," etc., in contradistinction to the constructing of fortifications and ships, his definition becomes more ambiguous. And should we have another Webster, he may take it into his head to include stoves and kitchen furniture as species of architecture, because they are built. In the Greek, whence the word is derived, to build is implied. It is upon this authority that Webster and other lexicographers base their definitions; and they endeavor to make them clearer by entailing upon them a host of other meanings that a barbarous and ignorant innovation may have suggested. That the definition, to *build*, as it was understood in the primitive days of our art, must now satisfy us, is more than philologists claim for words equally as important. They constantly acknowledge variations and innovations to suit the demands of the times. *Architecture* is one of the very few words that have not been metamorphosed by lexicographers.

The process of *building* is now conducted in a different manner from what it was in the days of Ictinus of Athens. It was the profession of the Greek architect to *build* as well as to *design*. From the designs that he made, he built with the assistance of workmen. Hence he was called the *chief builder*, and the work he produced, *building*. The construction of the building, as well as what we now call its architecture, was executed by one man. This may be made plainer by the mention of William of Sens, who is the first master-mason of any account that we have record of, in England. It is accepted that in him the artist and builder were combined. Dallaway says: "That the sumptuous temples in which ancient Greece abounded, were the work of architects, in combination with a fraternity of masons, no reasonable doubt can be entertained."

It is not necessary to show that *building* and *architecture* were the work of the same mind and the same hand, from the remotest times to the decadence of free-masonry, in Christian Europe. Free-masonry existed at different periods in all parts of the world until the Reformation; and the master-mason was known as the chief-builder. The works that the chief-builders produced were called buildings, and no distinction was made between the architecture of the building, and the mechanical labor upon it. In the days of the ancient builders and the society of the free-masons, the workmen employed on the buildings were "literally architects," and the works they produced were, like sculpture and painting, classed among the fine arts. It becomes necessary, if we desire to preserve architecture in its well-earned position of one of the fine arts, to distinguish between architecture and building. Building is now a craft, architecture an art. Our buildings are not put up by artists, nor do architects build as artisans. There must be a difference in their several productions; one is building, and the other architecture. Therefore, architecture is not the manual work of building; it is not the art of constructing.

I will give an instance to show the necessity of discriminating between architecture and building, between artists and artisans. The rustic fountain that used to *decorate* Bowling Green was designed by an architect. It was built from the design by builders. It proved to be a failure, because the builders of it

were not architects. It required artists to lay up the stones, as it did to conceive the design. All works of this nature, undertaken in our day, must prove failures because builders are not architects. Had the architect who designed the fountain practised his profession, as William of Sens or the architects of Greece did, he would have built the fountain himself, and with the aid of his assistants have produced in stone what was acknowledged to be good upon paper.

It has got to be quite common to say that "Architecture is the art of constructing a building so as to express the uses and purposes for which it was designed." In this definition it is plainly seen that all idea of art-work in the building is excluded by the word constructing, for constructing can mean nothing else than building. A hovel may express its uses. A sugar-house may show by its numerous stories and ill-proportioned windows the uses for which it was constructed; yet no gentleman here will say that *that* is architecture. The thatched roof, the unglazed window, and the man-hole of the hovel; the contracted windows and the numerous chimneys of the tenement-house may convey to the beholder the uses for which they were built. Is *it* architecture? Why do men who create this kind of architecture become debased? Architecture is ennobling, and elevates the workman. It is said that the cornice is architecture. So it is, and as such must be distinguished from the mere mechanical labor of the wall that it adorns. *Building* may construct the walls and put openings in them, but *architecture* beautifies and adorns them.

The view which Gwilt takes of this question may not surprise you, when his proverbial modesty will not permit him to associate architecture with sculpture and painting. Architecture must be always a mere matter of scientific building with him. His love of the orders, and antipathy to Gothic architecture are sufficient evidences that the module of the ancients is of more importance to him than the laws of the Gothic architects. In his "Encyclopædia of Architects" he has fallen into the same error with all of our encyclopædists. He says: "Architecture is the art of building, according to certain proportions and uses determined and regulated by nature and art." He defines the duties of an architect to be "to design and superintend the erection of any building." This is inconsistent. He makes the workmen of his building architects, if *superintend* means to build. If it does not mean to build, how can architecture be the art of building? It is not as bad as the definition given directly before it, inasmuch as it does not permit that æsthetic judgment, which is allowed to condemn or praise, according as education or whims may dictate.

Horatio Greenough, as quoted by Emerson, exclaims, "Here is my theory of structure (!)—A scientific arrangement of spaces and forms to functions and to site; an emphasis of features proportioned to their *graded* importance in function; color and ornament to be decided, and arranged, and varied by strictly organic laws, having a distinct reason for each decision; the entire and immediate banishment of all make-shift and make-believe." This partakes strongly of the German manner of making their ideas known. It is verbose, transcendental, and perhaps obscure, but it approaches nearer to what architecture means in our day than either of the foregoing definitions.

It would not be difficult to produce many more effusions of the lexicographic brain, in the same style as those already quoted. In them might be found the same stereotyped words handed down to us with the greatest possible care.

The revival of the arts is in its infancy among us. It is based

upon broad and sure grounds. Architecture must throw off the yoke that binds her professors to *building*. Architecture now is studied and practised in a new manner. Its professors are compelled to lay a new foundation for it, and it behooves us well to understand the dogmas of its new theory, and the material of which the superstructure of the art is to be built. Let us understand what we profess, and, knowing what we have to do, do it. Ruskin has taught us a great many valuable things in our art, and it seems to me that he has a better appreciation of our art, and understanding of what we ought to know, than many of its professors. I submit his definition of architecture, hoping it will be our guide, and that its exalted tone may carry our minds and aims upwards and onwards to the realm of noblest art. It is this: "Architecture is the art which so disposes and adorns the edifices raised by man for whatsoever uses, that the sight of them contribute to his mental health, power, and pleasure."

And now to my subject. Each style of architecture owes its existence to the religion which is coeval with it. One religion and one corresponding architecture are marked indelibly and unmistakably upon all religious monuments. Various religions have given birth to various styles of architecture, but no two great periods or individual styles have been produced by the same religion. Christianity "abode upon the world" and invented Gothic architecture. The unity existed as long as the doctrines of Christianity were promulgated free of error. When superstitions and errors grew rife, architecture, like her parent, became corrupted. Now that the Church is growing in "all might, majesty, and power," supported by the tendency of Christians to unity in belief, so is there an inclination to restore her ancient ally to its former power and greatness. Gothic art assisted Christianity in its progress towards its material and visible greatness; and in return it acknowledged its dependence on religion. Religion and art cannot be separated.

The tendency of the age is to a restoration of the primitive character of the church and her architecture; no new style is desired, nor can it be created. The church has its style in the monuments of the fourteenth century. It abhors all others. To trace the affinity that exists between religion and architecture, and to show that they are inseparable in their existence, I will briefly review the history of religion and architecture, of the nations that have lived before us.

Religion is the mother of architecture; this view of her maternal character finds corroborating instances in every era of history. In Egypt, her powers were employed in the erection of temples, idols, and catacombs. The belief of the Egyptians required that, to preserve the soul, the body should exist after death. To accomplish this purpose, embalming was first resorted to, and mausoleums were erected in which the embalmed bodies were placed. The Egyptians required that these burial-places should be indestructible and impervious to the action of the elements. The tombs of the pyramids and the rock-hewn catacombs were erected, that the souls of the dead might enjoy in them an imperishable life, and that these architectural beauties might magnify the importance of the state in which the soul was supposed to exist. As a consequence, the buildings of Egypt were erected in the manner that would be most serviceable in resisting the assaults of time, and inspire the beholder with awe and reverence for the dead. The greatest importance was attached to tombs and burial-places, and the most precious of metals and the most valuable labor of the nation were employed in their construction. Thus, architecture

participated in disseminating the pagan doctrines, and was a hallowed and venerated art. Their sepulchres were conspicuous objects for the reverence of the living. A visible and an invisible religion were made one in the houses of the dead. Its creed was stamped upon its temples. The pyramids of Gizeh, the King of Oaria's mausoleum, and the sacred temples of Egypt, require but to be noticed to recall to your minds the zeal and activity of a people so morally degraded by their faith, while yet, through the instrumentality of their religion, some of its greatest wonders were given to the world.

Before contemplating Grecian architecture and its connection with the Eleusinian mysteries, I will appropriate a portion of this paper to the consideration of an era of art which does not fill a very large space in history. I mean that of Palestine, or the Holy Land. In this period, the structure of heathen mythology was shaken to its foundation by the oracles of God. And history records constant collisions between one nation just emerging from barbarism, and another who had received through their prophets the commands of God. The Jewish dispensation was preparatory to the Advent of our Lord, and consequently we do not look for those numerous and gorgeous edifices in Palestine that are the productions of tranquil times and a permanent religion. King Solomon erected the grandest temple in Jerusalem, and dedicated it to the honor and glory of God, with great pomp and ceremony. He was guilty, at a subsequent time, of idolatrous worship in the same land where he had reared a temple for the worship of the true God. Such changes were of frequent occurrence in the Holy Land. During this unsettled state of religious affairs, we cannot expect to find much attention paid to the fine arts. Palestine had no peculiar architecture. Her boast was the temple of Jerusalem and the house of the feast of Labanon. Villalpanda attributes to the Jews the invention of a peculiar style of architecture, or rather he considers the orders of it the direct revelation of God.

Christianity was dawning upon the world, and we must look to a future period for its works of art; when its enlightening beams shone upon the world in all the resplendence of divine perfection, and it gave us Christian art on which it has stamped its character, never to fade away.

Let us approach the propylæum of the Grecian temple, and notwithstanding the sacredness attributed to it by Pausanias, pry into its mysteries, and see how closely the Grecian mythology is associated with the temple in which it was celebrated.

The architecture of the Egyptians was ponderous, uncouth, and ugly. It grew naturally out of a religion whose gods were of a monstrous nature. The necessities of the Grecian religion demanded a more graceful and poetic architecture. Instead of worshipping deified animals of the most hideous forms conceivable, the thought of which debased the human intellect, the new religion taught obedience to gods of perfect human form. It was a religion of love and sacrifice. It cannot be doubted that it was more humanizing than the old, and that the architecture of ancient Greece in its greatness must be attributed to the increased civilization of its people through the instrumentality of its religion. The temples that were the abode of gods whom they endowed with perfection, required different treatment from the pagan temples built under the law of the older mythology. Only a religion of poetry and love could produce those temples, whose grandeur the remnants upon the plains of Greece attest so sadly. And it is surprising that a nation which prostrated itself in the dust in the worship of its mon-

strous idols, should give birth to one whose love of the beautiful has never been surpassed; this, too, when an all-seeing and judging God was unknown to that nation.

It is unreasonable to suppose that the doctrine and practice of the Egyptians were of themselves capable of producing this change. Greece owes her greatness to her religion. And what would her greatness have been without her temples? They were studies in stone of her religion and civilization that gave tone to the moral and social character of her people. They were dedicated to her gods as imperishable monuments of a nation's gratitude to her protectors. How nobly they have accomplished their purpose! The immortality of Greece was purchased by the sacrifices that her people were ever zealous to make in the encouragement of the arts and civilization.

The Eleusinian mysteries may be imperfectly known, but the Parthenon, the Erechtheum, will never be forgotten. They were handmaids to the elevation of a race, imbued with the love of Art and liberty, that raised it to the highest point of fame, attainable by a nation not inspired with a love of the true God.

Religion, the power that has always fostered the arts, and always erected its own monuments to commemorate its liberality, has given great evidence of its influence over mankind in the majestic temples that it reared in the palmiest days of Rome. Rome did not possess an entire new religion, nor did she possess an entire new architecture. The round arch which became so powerful an auxiliary in the adaptation of the Grecian styles to the wants of the new religion, was borrowed in an incipient state from the Egyptians. It was with the old mythology and architecture of Greece that Rome linked her greatness. The mythology of the Greeks was carried to the new and fertile soil of Italy; upon it were engrafted the native legends of Latium. Thus prepared, it grew to be a mythology not wholly peculiar to Rome. It could not claim originality, when the scions that the Latins engrafted upon the parent stock did not outgrow the predominant characteristics of the progenitor. Nor can it claim to be the invention of a new style. Its new ritual required a different treatment from that of the parent, but to accomplish the purpose the modifications and additions were but slight. Jupiter Stator, and the Pantheon are the majestic productions of the mongrel religion. It exhibits in its works the distinguishing features of its worship. Thus were religion and architecture, one leaning upon the other, firmly established in Rome. No ordinary circumstance was to deprive them of their position in the management of the affairs of the world. Architecture was the last to succumb to the new order of society foretold by the prophets.

The tenacity with which architecture adhered to its maxims—that "the round arch should never be conquered"—is nowhere more forcibly illustrated than at the time the Christians of Rome first dared to promulgate their doctrines. For three hundred years the subterranean quarries protected them from the wrath of the infuriated pagans. And when they came forth from the catacombs, they raised up in such places as were temporarily allotted to them, new altars, and decked them with the monograms and symbols of their crucified Saviour. Christianity existed in Rome, in a transition state, but for a short time; and it was during this period that the round arch strove to foist itself upon her in the churches reared for the worship of God. The pagans became jealous of the innovations of their new teachers; and to show their contempt for all works of art that were likely to supersede their own, they gave to Christian

architecture the name of "Gothic"—a name by which that architecture is now generally known throughout the world.

No religion ever created more than one style of architecture; and architecture has never known two faithful masters of any one of her various styles. The churches of S. Sophia and S. Vitalis, and the basilica of S. Paolo fuori le Mura, are evidences of the struggle that Christianity endured in order to rid herself of the material forms indigenous to a pagan religion. The worn-out round arch that had grown old in the service of the heathen, whose form lent no aid to the Christian worshipper, suggested no holy thoughts, was not destined to be a component part in the fabric raised to glorify the living God. Christianity invented the pointed arch for its proper purposes, rising heavenward to the throne of the Being, from whose mind it descended, and by whose will it was established.

In all ages, the tendency of architecture is to keep pace with the religion to which it owes its existence, that it may be identified with all progressive movements tending to the advancement of human knowledge. If the architecture of Greece and Rome made such rapid and astonishing strides in their respective epochs, under the laws of a debasing idolatry, it is not expecting too much of Christian architecture that her productions should be more artistic in conception, of more ingenious construction, and of greater magnificence. For the influences of Christianity were elevating and humanizing beyond what the world had ever seen before. Her churches are in all the corners of the earth.

The nature of the pagan religion is to assimilate itself with the fabric in which its rites are celebrated. This tendency is also observable in the Christian religion, and some worthy persons have fancied it derogatory to the holiness and spirituality of that religion. Great efforts have been made to separate the material and spiritual in the catholic fabric. It is impossible. They are inseparable. "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." Their affinities are natural and constant, and it is unreasonable to suppose that a separation could be made when the lessons of "Christ crucified" are to be taught to all nations to the end of the world, and to give everlasting life to the tables of stone on which the decalogue is indelibly graven. As well restore the temples of India without the Brahminical religion, or the pyramids without the Egyptian, as to preach Christianity without churches. "The divine order and economy of the one seems to be emblematically set forth by the just, plain, and majestic architecture of the other; and as the one consists of a great variety of parts united in the same regular design, according to the truest art and most exact proportion, so the other contains a decent subordination of members, various sacred institutions, sublime doctrines, and solid precepts of morality, digested into the same design, and with an admirable concurrence tending to one view—the happiness and exaltation of human nature."

The teachings and practices of the author of Christianity abound with instances of his great regard and love for those material things that lent their strength to the praises of the Father. The apostles exhorted the people to worship "decently and in order."

As soon as it was expedient for the primitive Christians to promulgate their doctrines openly to the heathen, the ancient basilicas of the Romans were temporarily resorted to, until such times as their strength and numbers would warrant the erection of churches suited to a Christian soil. What noble aspirations! That the world should be filled with gorgeous edifices, the mu-

nificent offerings of a holy people to a just God! And how truly they have been realized—Cologne, York-minster, Strasbourg, and Lincoln, bear testimony, with a thousand others.

Superstition, the evil results of sin, and infidelity, may undermine the holy religion of our forefathers, and let into their architecture additions and incongruities, but they will be short-lived and like volcanic eruptions upon the earth's surface, that give vent to her impurities, and then pass away. St. Peter's, the church Del Redentore, and St. Paul's, are huge architectural humors and gigantic excrescences that threatened at one time to debilitate the body of true architecture, and reduce it to death. When pagan architecture usurps the place of Christianity, then will Christianity pass away from the earth, and the idolatry of the heathen be restored in all its poetic and fabulous falsehoods. But both are impossible. Happily for our art, the intrigues of Rome have not succeeded in getting its architecture accepted as an exponent of the true faith. Romish art is strong in its own isolated defence, but it must eventually succumb to its old enemy—the Gothic.

Architecture has been shown to rise and fall in its career, the same as the religions that have been coeval with it, from the remotest periods of antiquity to the Reformation. From that time to the revival of Gothic art its progress has been dubious and unsatisfactory. But the Church, as ever of old, is now teaching the necessity of an appropriate and decent observance of her ritual. Christian art is again called upon to throw off the lethargy that has been upon her so long, and wake up to the importance of restoring herself to her former position. Skepticism and erroneous dogmas are protected by the thin veil of civilization, and it is important that church architecture should arise and stand forth crowned with the halo of glory thrown around her by the sacredness of her cause.

Amidst the confusion that prevails in the ranks of the enemies of the primitive religion, who are opposed to the restoration of her architecture, there has grown up an inclination to create a new style—one that should conform to the character and promote the influences of their doctrines. That this is inexpedient and futile, the growth of a true taste in art tends to prove. To lend our abilities to the creation and development of styles of architecture that would be in harmony with the many heterogeneous and erroneous doctrines, would be giving up ourselves not only to the enemies of an architecture native in the church, but encourage them in their crusade against the mother of civilization and religious art. It would be mispent time and unrequited labor against a tide that is drifting the denominations to the haven where all can rest in security. They are divided into a thousand sects. Some of them are beginning to acknowledge the error of their ways in their peculiar adaptation of church architecture to their religious wants. This is evidence that there is a germ of good in their aspirations, and it behooves us, as we love our art, to foster and encourage this feeling, and give our utmost power to the development of Christian architecture wherever our lot may be cast, in the church or out of it. By taking this course, prejudices will be overcome, and an easy path made for the progress of true Art in its full beauty and significant symbolism. Our labor will be bountifully rewarded if we keep in view the object sought to be accomplished. Instances may be cited in the brief space of time that has elapsed since the Reformation to show that the field is ripening and the harvest near at hand. The whitewashed frame "meeting-houses" that used to be good enough for the haters of our consecrated art, have given place to

imagery and gorgeously apparelled stone churches. The cross, the holiest symbol of the church, once torn from her walls, and defiled and trodden under foot, now fills its ancient office on the churches of its old destroyers.

I conclude that the study of a "new style" is needless, and in opposition to the real and enlightened wishes of those who apparently desire it, but who are safely growing up to an appreciation of the old and better style. There may be obstructions to remove; and when a more devout interest shall be taken in the worship of God and the proper observance of the liturgy of the church, instead of the glorification of an Apollo or a Cephas, the restoration of the one and only true Gothic will be more easy of accomplishment.

I hope the importance of giving our undivided attention to the study of Gothic architecture will be acknowledged. That it is feasible there is no doubt. The religion to which we owe so many blessings demands it. Christian people are ready with open arms to receive it. The history of Art corroborates the maxim that no two styles were invented by the same religion. Our religion has its style. We may hesitate, but there must be *unity; unity in religion, unity in architecture, and the union of both.*

L. Eidlitz concurred fully with the author in the sentiments expressed in the above paper. Feudalism gave birth to Gothic Architecture, it also laid the foundation to free and representative forms of government, the advantages of which we now enjoy. The Renaissance was but a blind return to the Classic styles. Michael Angelo did great harm to architecture; and, in his opinion, the churches of St. Peter in Rome, and St. Paul in London, had injured the cause of architecture more than any buildings that had ever been erected.

R. M. Hunt thought that the paper just listened to with so much interest, substantially proved that Gothic architecture should give way to another style (in Protestant countries at least) and history certainly corroborated this statement. At the advent of printing, science, literature, and Art arose from the lethargy to which they had been doomed for so many centuries. At the Reformation, as the author of the paper now in discussion had remarked, a *new style of architecture* was necessary to express the *change in religion*. Ignorance and superstition no longer held full sway; and then it was, at that brilliant epoch, that the architecture of the Dark Ages was supplanted by one more in accordance with the enlightenment of the age—the Renaissance. Mr. Hunt differed with the gentleman who had just spoken, in his opinion of the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul; and although he was a great admirer of Gothic architecture, he must be permitted to say that he had been quite as religiously impressed by the above mentioned churches as by any so-called monuments of Christian Art.

Richard Upjohn stated that although most of his life had been spent in the study of Gothic architecture, and, although he intended to continue to devote his time and exertions towards its revival, yet he could not but acknowledge that many of the most impressive Christian monuments were not Gothic. The Lombard and other Romanesque styles, for instance, furnished some of the most ennobling and impressive religious edifices. He believed also that none of the churches of the Jesuits, were Gothic. He also stated subsequently that he had been affected by the majesty and simplicity of the Pantheon at Rome, in a degree almost equal to that of the religious impressions produced by our best cathedrals.

Mr. Van Brunt had observed that the general tendency of

this discussion, as he understood it, was an endeavor to prove that the Gothic architecture of the 13th century presented the best *motives* for our own use and guidance, while the classic and other kindred styles were not to be recognized as schools for building in the present day. It had been remarked in *extenso* that, as we have a closer religious sympathy with the Gothic age than with any classic, this sympathy should extend to our architecture. Admitting the force of this principle, he would venture to assert that if in our ecclesiastical edifices it is proper to draw our inspiration from an age so expressive of religious enthusiasm as the Gothic, we should not for the same reason confine ourselves to this era in composing our domestic architecture. However much the childlike earnestness of the Gothic styles, their adoration, their beautiful worship, their candor and magnificence, however much these qualities may appeal to our religious sympathies, we seek in vain among these models for what may express domestic comfort and elegance. We do not desire about our homes those forms of monumental solemnity or tender simplicity in which the Gothic is so fertile. The invention and learning of architects are used at least as frequently for the composition of domestic as ecclesiastical edifices, and it is proper to make the past our school as much in the one instance as the other. This being the case, we must seek for some other era which has indicated in its buildings something nearer akin to our home feelings and to the refinement and luxury of our firesides. Mr. Van Brunt knew of no domestic architecture of the past whose grand plans were so expressive, of these qualities and of the elegance and comfort which we desire, as that of Pompeii and Herculaneum. Compare it with the domestic architecture of the purest Gothic age, and we will at once be struck with the intellectuality of the one and the barbarity of the other. In fact, nowhere can we find so entire an expression of intellectual refinement and luxurious elegance as in the modified Greek style of the Pompeian villa. He reminded the Institute how these qualities were expressed in the studied originality of every detail; and, bearing these things in mind, as well as the pliability and constructive truth of this style, he considered himself justified in the belief that no other was better fitted to enshrine the Lares and Penates of an intellectual and elegant people. He would add that in this, as in other instances, we are to fill ourselves with the sentiments and motives of the model, and not be content with the mere servile copying of it—a proceeding which would, of course, result in buildings unfitted for our use.

Mr. Upjohn recommended the study of all styles, for the purpose of adapting the beauty contained in them.

THE sciences of which the study affords the greatest exercise to the understanding are not those whose principles are the most fixed and demonstrable, as, for instance, natural philosophy or mathematics; but such as involve a degree of fluctuation, and require the balancing of probabilities, as political or mental philosophy, ethics, or human nature in its individual manifestations. To borrow an illustration from the fine arts: the former may be compared to the capitals of Corinthian columns, or friezes of regular proportions, which, however necessary or ornamental, demand no invention or fancy in the architect, but only adherence to a model, with a certain amount of mechanical skill. The latter resemble the arabesque or old Gothic embellishments, the draperies, and more intricate combinations of beauty, which require not only a wider range, but a loftier order of talent.—*Clulow.*

Foreign Correspondence, Items, etc.

HOLLAND—*Amsterdam.*—German artists have again achieved the greatest success at the annual exhibition at this place, especially with their *genre* pictures. Dunker's "Pawnbroker's Shop" created a sensation, and was sold a few days after the opening of the exhibition. The picture represents a woman of refinement compelled by pecuniary reverses to resort to a pawnbroker's shop. The distressed and embarrassed appearance of the poor lady, the Shylock's eyes of the greedy pawnbroker, the impudent stare of his clerk, two drunken fellows who loiter about in the shop—all combine to give an intense and remarkable aspect of reality.—Another picture, by Jordan, has also the merit of appealing to universal sympathies. It represents the funeral of the last-born child, displaying the sorrow of parent and grand-parents, and of the eldest brother, as well as the innocence of younger children, who playfully follow the hearse, carrying flowers, unable yet to sympathize with the mournful occasion.—Grund, of Baden-Baden, sent a picture representing a few precocious lads indulging in the luxury of smoking, giving not a very flattering although very truthful idea of the propensities of Young Germany.—A recent auction has rather given disappointment by the low prices at which many most exquisite paintings were sold. "A Falconry," by Philip Wouwermans, brought \$50; a remarkable Westphalian landscape by Van Borssum brought \$250; "A Girl's Head," by Greuze, sold for \$80; and an Italian landscape by Moucheron for \$70.

DORTRECHT.—The illustrious painter, Ary Scheffer, has bequeathed to the museum here a portrait of Sir Joseph Reynolds, painted by him, and various other works of art. A committee has been formed for the purpose of collecting funds for a monument to Scheffer.

DRESDEN.—One of the most distinguished engravers of modern times, Moritz Steinla, died Sept. 21 last at the age of sixty-seven. His best works are his engravings after Titian, Raphael, and Fra Bartolomeo.—The artistic world here is just now agitated by a most virulent theological controversy on the subject of Rietschel's monument to Luther. The question is whether to represent the great reformer with the cowl of a Roman monk or in the garb of a Protestant divine. At the Diet of Worms Luther actually wore his cowl, although he is usually represented with a cloak. Rietschel seems to question the propriety of substituting the latter for the former, but the probability is that he will decide on the Protestant garb as symbolical of Luther's historical mission.

ITALY—*Florence.*—The general topic of conversation in art-circles continues to be the recently discovered frescoes by Masaccio, in the church of Santa Maria Novella. They represent his celebrated picture of the Trinity, alluded to in Vasari's life of the great artist, and were discovered in the early part of 1857 on the occasion of removing the altar for the purpose of restoring the floor of the church. The study of these frescoes sheds new light upon other works of the same master, and of Masolino and Filippino Lippi in the Brancacci Chapel, and of Masolino's frescoes at Castiglione D'Olena—a little town on the road from Milan to Varese.—The cause of the *Galleria Buonarroti* will soon come before the courts. This gallery, as those who are familiar with current events are probably aware, was established in the house inhabited by Michael Angelo, and the permanence of its existence was secured in the will of Cosimo Buonarroti; the secretary of the ministry of public instruction, who died